

REMARKS

A. Status of the Application

Claims 1-36 are presently pending in the application.







The Applicant has amended Claim 1, and renumbered Claims 4-34.

With this response, the Applicant has submitted formal drawings for Figures 1-4.

B. Objections to the Claims

The Examiner objected to claims 4-34 for failing to comply with the standard claim numbering as set forth in 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c). In particular, the Examiner objected to claims which were separated from the particular claim on which they depended by claims which did not depend upon that same particular claim.

The objection was made due to the Applicant's error in having original Claim 33 directly dependent upon Claim 1, and original Claim 34 directly dependant upon Claim 18. With this response, Applicant has renumbered the claims in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c). The renumbered claims are designated by the dotted-line boxes on the following claim trees.

Original NumberingAmended Numbering

C. Rejections of the Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 1-17 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner took issue with the inclusion of the term “high bit-rate” as applied to decompressed video content in Claim 1.

Applicant had amended Claim 1 with this response, and removed the term “high bit-rate”. The particular clause of Claim 1 which gave rise to this objection now reads:

*the compressed digital video content received by the
decompression unit comprises unencrypted compressed
digital video content, and the decompressed digital video
content rendered by the projection unit comprises
unencrypted decompressed digital video content;*

Applicant believes this amendment puts Claims 1-17 in compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, and requests reconsideration of these claims.

D. Rejections of the Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7-9, 18-22, 25-31 and 33-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0016825 (“Jones”). Jones was filed on July 10, 2001 and published as a U.S. Patent Application on January 23, 2003. The above application was filed on November 28, 2001, prior to the issue publication date of Jones, but after the Jones filing date. Accordingly, Jones qualified as prior art to the above application only under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as the Examiner noted.

The attached 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 declaration of the sole inventor, Paul Moroney, establishes that the instant invention was conceived and reduced to practice prior to the filing date of Jones. Particularly, the attached declaration establishes that the subject matter of the claimed invention of the above application was submitted to the law department of General Instrument Corporation no later than December 27, 2000. Accordingly, the attached declaration antedates Jones, thus removing it as prior art. See, MPEP 715. Hence, Applicant respectfully requests the above rejection under Jones be withdrawn.

E. Rejections of the Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Jones in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,731,785 (“Lemelson”).

The Examiner rejected claims 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Jones in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,141,530 (“Rabowsky”).

The Examiner rejected claims 12-13, 23 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Jones in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,499,046 (“Schiller”).

The Examiner rejected claims 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Jones and Schiller in view Rabowsky.

All of the above rejections were predicated upon the Jones reference. The attached § 1.131 declaration of the sole inventor, Paul Moroney, establishes that the invention of the above application was conceived and reduced to practice prior to the filing date of Jones. In this response the Applicant has provided an documentation attesting to the fact that Jones should not be considered as prior art to the present invention. Consequently, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections, as Jones not prior art to the instant application.

CONCLUSION


Applicant and his counsel thank the Examiner for the teleconference of July 26, 2005, and the clarification provided with respect to the 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c) objections.

Having fully responded to the Office Action, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Should any issues arise that prevent early allowance of the above application, the examiner is invited contact the undersigned to resolve such issues.

To the extent an extension of time is needed for consideration of this response, Applicant hereby request such extension and, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account number 502117 for any fees associated therewith.

Dated: July 28, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Robert P. Marley
Registration No.: 32,914

Motorola Connected Home Solutions
101 Tournament Drive
Horsham, PA 19044
(215) 323-1907

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Applicant has submitted formal drawings for all of the originally filed figures on four replacement sheets attached hereto. The Examiner is requested to accept the revised drawings for FIGURE 1, FIGURE 2, FIGURE 3 and FIGURE 4. No modifications have been made to the content of the original drawings outside of formalization.